

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: December 1 and 8, 2005

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Marc Laurin, Cathy Goodmen, Kevin Nyhan, Jon Evans, Charles Hood, Bill Hauser, Den Danna; Alex Vogt, Bob Landry, Chris Waszczuk, Chris Carucci, and Terry Place NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Harry Kinter and Bill O'Donnell, FHWA; John Silva, FAA and Rich Fixler, Manchester Airport; Amy Dixon and Jeff Cicerello, Berger; Steve Bird, City of Dover; Steve White, FST; Jason Ayotte, HTA; Jamie Paine, CLD; Marie Thomas, FEMA; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; Mark Wamser, Gomez and Sullivan; Deb Loiselle, DES; and Joe Ducharm, PTG Environmental.

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

NOTES ON CONFERENCE

Thursday, December 1, 2005

Bedford-Manchester-Londonderry, DPR-F-0047(001), 11512. Participants: Alex Vogt, Tony King, Cathy Goodmen, and John Silva, FAA and John Hagopian, Manchester Airport

Under NHDOT's current agreement with the Manchester Airport for the construction of the access road, NHDOT will demolish nine World War II buildings. J. Silva of FAA was updated about history of determination of eligibility for the historic district composed of the nine building. L. Wilson stated that the nine buildings had never received a final determination because they were not going to be immediately affected at the time the document was prepared in the mid-1990s. FHWA has agreed to support the documentation of the buildings. Mitigation for the demolition of the buildings would include the creation of an exhibit illustrating the airport's role in World War II and the general history of the airport. Options for such a display were discussed. NHDHR had requested an exhibit in the Aviation History Museum and a brief display in the airport itself, which would refer to the larger exhibit in the Aviation Museum.

John Silva indicated that the airport main concern is security, does not want people congregating in any one area. L. Wilson- suggested placing information on the airports' web site. H. Kinter suggested using the airport for a brief display to point potential visitors to a larger scale exhibit in the museum, and he supported putting information on the airport's web site. J. Silva stated that FAA had maxed out on mitigation money after the moving of the airport terminal. H. Kinter stated that FHWA and NHDOT were not necessarily looking for money, but guarantee that displays installed will be around for a while and maintained by airport. And, he stated that once a decision had been reached, the MOA should be amended. L. Wilson noted that the Arts Council

had such agreements with airport on to display art. It was suggested that the aviation museum should be involved from the beginning and to contact Jack Ferns.

A. Vogt stated that NHDOT had planned to advertise in February 2006 and that there is need to get all documentation done soon. J. McKay stated that if the weather cooperated the fieldwork would be completed December 9th. [Fieldwork was not completed until December 22 because of adverse weather conditions]. The consultant will also look at buildings for any salvageable items of historic value to add to educational displays. E. Feighner stated that NHDHR had been contacted by the airport about the demolition of another building at the airport. J. Hagopian stated that a hanger, probably from the same time period as the old terminal, would be demolished because it is ready to collapse. L. Wilson requested that Preservation Company take some large format photographs when documenting the other buildings. H. Kinter indicated that it would be appropriate. We will contact the Aviation Museum to get input from them, and J. Hagopian will consult with airport officials about placing a small exhibit panel in the current terminal.

Windham STP-TE-X-000S(343), 13113 Participants: Cathy Goodmen

The project widens Lowell Road, south of NH Route 111 in the Town of Windham. C. Goodmen discussed the project with Linda Wilson. The only permanent easements at historic properties on this project will be a permanent drainage easement at lot 32. L. Wilson determined it would have no historic impact on the property, and we do not need to complete an individual, DOE survey form.

Dover X-A000(136), 13945. Participants: Amy Dixon and Jeff Cicerello, Berger and Steve Bird, City of Dover Planning Office

On 1 December, 2005 representatives of The Louis Berger Group, Inc. and the City of Dover met with representatives from NHDOT, FHWA, and NHDHR at their bi-monthly inter-agency cultural resources meeting to identify potential historical or archaeological concerns with respect to the proposed bridge replacement project in Dover.

Jeff Cicerello opened the meeting with an overview of the proposed project, highlighting that the intention of the proposed project is to restore vehicular access from Washington Street over the Cocheco River to connect to River Street. The City of Dover plans a waterfront redevelopment project in the River Street vicinity in the future. The bridge replacement project will involve moving the existing pedestrian bridge and reconstruction of a new vehicular bridge at the site. It is the intent to store the pedestrian bridge on site until a suitable place is determined for its reinstallation.

Linda Wilson stated that the former vehicular bridge at this location was preemptively demolished by the City of Dover without undergoing Section 106 review some 25 years ago. She inquired if there are any residual effects as a result of the City's removal of the previous bridge without having complied with Section 106. Her concern was that FHWA may have instituted restrictions on the City's use of federal funding after not complying with Section 106, and she wanted to make sure there are not any stipulations or restrictions associated with this project with regard to funding as a result of past actions.

Harry Kinter stated that since the demolition of the previous Washington Street Bridge that the City of Dover has complied with Section 106 in the intervening 25 years, and that as long as Section 106 is complied with in future cases, that there are no restrictions on the use of federal funding, nor is there such thing as retro-active penalty for past projects.

Harry Kinter asked if there are any known historic resources in the project area. Amy Dixon stated that there is several individually listed National Register of Historic Places properties nearby, but none that are immediately adjacent to the project area. The mill building southwest of the existing pedestrian bridge is the closest historic-period property, and has not been evaluated for National Register eligibility. Amy Dixon passed out a series of historical maps of the project area. From these maps it is evident that the area east of the river (where the proposed waterfront redevelopment is slated) was formerly a coal yard for the nearby mills and in later years was the location of the City's Public Works and Highway Department.

Edna Feighner stated that the currently proposed project area has been disturbed by previous construction in the immediate area around the bridge, and for the purpose of the bridge replacement project is not concerned with archaeological resources. She added that the riverfront redevelopment site might have the potential to contain prehistoric or historic archaeological sites. She urged the City of Dover to continue its consultation with the agencies with regard to cultural resources as the riverfront redevelopment project proceeds, since the redevelopment will likely include state and federal permits that will involve Section 106 review.

Steve Bird gave a brief overview of the riverfront redevelopment plans, and stated that a developer would hopefully be chosen in early 2006.

Harry Kinter asked whether there would be any improvements along Washington Street to tie in with the new vehicular bridge. Jeff Cicerello explained that there would be grade changes associated with the new bridge construction, but that the cross section of the street would not change. Harry Kinter stated that it was his opinion that Section 106, therefore, was not an issue for this bridge replacement project. Linda Wilson stated that she agreed that the project has no adverse effect on historic properties.

Amy Dixon asked what would be required to document that the project has no adverse effect. Joyce McKay stated that meeting minutes and the completion of a Cultural Resources Memorandum of Effect for municipally managed projects would satisfy Section 106 for this project, and that she would provide an electronic copy of the proper form for completion.

Laconia Freight House (no project numbers). Participant: Joyce McKay and Jim Garvin

J. McKay briefly discussed the handicap access ramp for the Laconia Freight House rehabilitation project by the town with J. Garvin. He observed that the ramp structure could be removed from the building. Such additive structures would not adversely affect the integrity of the building. He was more concerned with making certain that the town follow the ADA standards, which were provided through the mailing sent to the town.

Portsmouth (no state/federal #). Participant: Steve White, FST.

FST is currently presenting a scope and fee to the town for the complete replacement of the Route 1 over Sagamore Creek Bridge (198/034), which includes sidewalks and a bikeway. The project will occur on the existing alignment, but there will be a temporary bridge during construction. The proposed replacement is a constant depth plate girder bridge design. The existing bridge is a continuous, variable section plate girder erected in the late 1930s or early 1940s. The bridge is a textbook example of its type. Since the project construction date is 2010-2011, there will be some intermediate rehabilitation. The bridge was previously rehabilitated in 1984.

In regards to the effect of the project on cultural resources, J. Garvin noted that the first bridge was placed on the site in the 1850s. He requested a survey form that includes the history of the crossing for the bridge to make a determination of eligibility, and he thought it important to have a consultant with expertise in the area of engineering history do the form. E. Feighner noted that the bridge went over a tidal creek, and the site is sensitive for the occurrence of Native American sites. She also noted that its site was one of the earliest areas to undergo settlement. When impacts from the project are known, a Phase IA archaeological survey should be completed.

Meredith, X-A000(100), 13899. Participant: Jason Ayotte, HTA (jayotte@hta-nh.com).

Mr. Ayotte began with a brief overview of the roadway's existing conditions, referring to the proposed plan for Waukewan Street. Mr. Ayotte also discussed the proposed improvements including the construction of a sidewalk along the northern edge of the pavement. The proposed sidewalk construction will connect existing sidewalk ending at Wall Street, and a sidewalk section from Lake Waukewan beach access and Main Street. Mr. Ayotte highlighted critical areas of the project with photos and descriptions.

J. McKay was concerned with potential impacts within 25' of the Nolte family cemetery located near Sta. 522+50. Mr. Ayotte stated that the cemetery was 75'-100' from the edge of the existing right-of-way. Most impacts are within the existing right-of-way. Near the Nolte Family Cemetery, the sidewalk will be cut into an embankment keeping impacts within the existing right-of-way.

H. Kinter questioned whether a proposed right-of-way taking or easement was needed for a fill section located on the potentially historic farm near Sta. 527+00. Mr. Ayotte explained that the Town of Meredith had initial discussions with the property owner, and they are confident that securing temporary easements would not be difficult. The slope lines were within the preliminary design phase and would be verified to keep impacts within the right-of-way. The goal of the project was to minimize disturbance and connect the break in sidewalks along Waukewan Street. If permanent easements on this property or impacts within 25' of the cemetery were needed, then a section 4 (f) review would be required.

H. Kinter raised additional concerns over tree removal and utility pole relocation. Mr. Kinter suggested notifying the owner of a potentially historic property of the tree removal and proposed planting a replacement tree on the abutter's property. Mr. Kinter also stated the post and rail fence may not meet ADA Standards and should be verified. Mr. Ayotte acknowledged Mr. Kinter's suggestions and will incorporate them as HTA continues towards final design and gathers input from the Town.

R. Maddali asked if the Town was proceeding with the multi-use path along the railroad corridor. Mr. Ayotte explained that the Town had discussions with the NHDOT Bureau of Railroad and Hobo Railroad. The railroad wanted a minimum of twenty-five feet separation between the railroad and path. This offset created wetlands impacts making the project difficult to permit in time to advertise this February and construct next summer. The Town has decided to delay this portion of the project, pending discussions with the railroad that would reduce the lateral distance requirement from the tracks to a proposed trail.

The committee agreed that upon verification that slope impacts were within the existing right-of-way, or only temporary easements were needed, that a finding of "No Adverse Effect" could be determined. HTA will provide a brief follow-up presentation, subsequent to preliminary design, to confirm this decision.

Significant Properties Along the Interstate System. Participants: Bill Hauser and Den Danna

B. Hauser noted that SAFETEA-LU exempts most of the interstate from 4(f) consideration except for properties of national significance and those already determined eligible for the National Register. FHWA will engage a consultant to document these properties in each state. The agency asks that state SHPOs and NHDOTs consider what interstate resources might attain national significance. B. Hauser stressed that these properties much attain considerable significance to be considered, since many of the elements of the interstate are less than fifty years old.

B. Hauser advised that FHWA was already considering the Franconia Notch Parkway as a possible nationally significant resource. Some SHPO representatives thought the Piscataqua River Bridge was worthy of consideration. L. Wilson noted the split barrels on I-93 and I-89, which in that era might have become a significant part of interstate design to cope with environmentally challenging locations and incorporate scenic views. It was acknowledged that the Robert Prowse Memorial or Ash Street Bridge over I-93 has already been determined eligible for the National Register..

It was concluded that a map with dates of construction for each section would be helpful to identify significant sections. It would be important to understand the conceptual planning that underlay the design of the interstate and how that is illustrated in its physical layout. There is no context for New Hampshire so the key design attributes are not well understood. It would be important to examine design decisions between 1945 and 1955 to identify such elements. These decisions should occur in the department records. Do sections of the interstate exist that are unique to New Hampshire's topography other than the Franconia Notch Parkway?

Flood Damaged Roads (14540). Participants: Marie Thomas, FEMA and Kevin Nyhan (1553), Charlie Hood, and Bob Landry

Discussing the eligibility of stone culverts, Jim Garvin noted that there was no context against which to judge the eligibility of this resource type. If the structures have any integrity and are likely over fifty years, it has been assumed that they are eligible. In such a context, it would be important to determine the range of culvert types, type prevalence, how the materials were

processed, and how the culverts were designed and constructed. Contextual development would require field inspection based on known locations as well as inferred locations from map research and knowledge of the development of local transportation networks such as old turnpikes and range roads. Massachusetts Highways has accumulated a considerable database on individual stone culverts, but has not developed a context for them. Knowledge of stone culverts should also be available at the district and town levels. The NPDES database for urban areas may identify the location of structures. Available textbooks written in the late nineteenth century provide some information concerning approaches to construction and possible culvert types.

In conjunction with developing a context, it would be important to establish standard protocols for treatment depending on the type of damage. Questions of treatment have already arisen in Canterbury (7 culverts), Warner, Swanzey, Unity, and Atkinson. It was noted that many of these structures have operated for over one hundred years, and most should be repairable and able to function for a considerable period.

In summary, the approach should be as follows:

1. For current purposes, eligibility will be assumed for all stone culverts that appear to be over 50 years. However, if this assessment is challenged, there is little information to back it up.
2. A stone mason would need to conduct damage assessments on some of them and recommend treatment.
3. A contextual study determining the significant types and examples of stone culverts, manner of construction, levels of integrity, typical damage and associated repairs with the means to assess when damage is too great for repair should be pursued as soon as possible in the spring to assist with recovery from flooding. It had been suggested by Harry Kinter that Survey, Planning, and Research monies might provide the best source of funding with additional funding from FEMA.
4. Awareness of the significance and durability of these structures should be promoted. The results of a contextual study will need to be disseminated to the towns and districts.

Ongoing discussion about the Unity Stone Box Culvert follows. The town has requested replacement, NHDHR finds it eligible, and such a replacement would require documentation:

Since this meeting, CLD Consulting Engineers has been working on the Town's behalf to receive FEMA and SHPO/NHDHR input to determine whether the stone box culvert can be replaced with a corrugated metal pipe (CMP). Per FEMA's requirements, CLD completed a hydrologic study of this area to determine the existing box culvert's capacity to carry storm waters. It determined that the stone box culvert is fairly well undersized for the quantity of water that passes through the area.

NHDHR determined that because the SHPO considers this an historic resource potentially eligible for listing in the National Register, the preferred alternative is to repair the exiting stone culvert, using existing or in-kind materials. This alternative results in a finding of no adverse effect, and no further requirement for documentation or examination of alternatives to avoid or minimize the adverse effect is required. Replacement of the culvert would be an adverse effect and will require the development, by FEMA, of an MOA incorporating mitigation measures to compensate for the loss of the resource.

Due to the undersized nature of the box culvert, the Town has decided that they would like to replace it with a CMP. The following has been recommended by CLD for mitigation of the stone box removal:

1. Provide NHDHR and FEMA with:
 - a. Standard 35mm black and white photographs of the stone box culvert from all directions (inlet, outlet, top of roadway, etc); and
 - b. Provide a brief written history of the area where this box culvert is located, in a HAER document format.
2. Upon installation of the corrugated metal pipe, use the existing field stones that make up the box culvert in locations close to the immediate area. Uses would include:
 - a. Possible development or improvement of stone walls; and/or
 - b. Possible placement for pipe headers in the area.

The Town is currently awaiting final approval/MOA from FEMA and NHDHR so that they may proceed to replace the box culvert and still be eligible for FEMA funding.

Thursday, December 8, 2005

Claremont (no project number). Participants: Rich Rooney, MacFarland-Johnson (225-2978)

As follow up to the November 17, 2005 Cultural Resources Meeting, the City of Claremont's selected bridge type with a inverted arch on the top chord was presented. The selected concept consists of a steel prefabricated pedestrian bridge. The concept was presented in plan and elevation views and described to the attendees.

Those attending the Cultural Resources Meeting commented that they found the proposed bridge concept attractive. A request was made that the retaining wall form liner pattern options reviewed by City of Claremont during final design be forwarded to the group for its review. These patterns will be sent to Joyce McKay for distribution when they become available. Contingent upon a future review of form liner patterns, the committee recommended that the Memorandum of Effect paperwork be processed. It concluded that pending documentation of the affected canal, a finding of a conditional no adverse effect be found.

Winchester 14360 (no federal #). Participants: Terry Place, Traffic and Jon Evans

The project involves the replacement of existing traffic signals at the intersection of NH Routes 10, 119 and Elm Street. Replacement will consist of replacing the current cable hung system with a system of 15, 25, 30 and 35-foot mast arms. The intersection will be resurfaced and per request of the town, a sidewalk will also be constructed in the northeast quadrant of the intersection.

Terry Place described the project and stated that the current system is outdated. He stated that should the single light in the center of the intersection be hit, it would take out the entire signalization system. He described the proposed system of mast arms and how it would improve the visibility of the lights.

Linda Wilson expressed some concern regarding the size of the mast arms since the project is located within a historic district. T. Place stated that the proposed design is necessary to allow for

proper visibility of the lights. Bill O'Donnell also stated that the sizes of the mast arms are dictated by the length that is necessary to center the light over the travel lane to permit maximum visibility.

Terry stated that they could paint the system black or green. Linda felt that the decision of color should be left up to the town. She stated that a Memorandum of No Adverse Effect would be necessary and that it should state that the decision was based on the DOT's minimization of the structures at each corner. Although L. Wilson preferred black or green, she stated that the color should be left up to the town.

Surplus Lands: Manchester, Keene, Barrington, and Andover. Participant: Jon Evans.

The City of Manchester wishes to build a sewer intercept along a railroad corridor adjacent to Candia Road. E. Feighner stated that there might be areas of archaeological sensitivity adjacent to the wetland areas. She requested a combined phase IA/IB survey along the corridor except in the wetland area itself before the transfer of this surplus parcel. It is assumed that the survey would be the city's responsibility. No other potential resources were identified..

An abutter near Keene Hospital has requested to purchase a 0.8-acre, state owned parcel along NH Route 9 in Keene. E. Feighner indicated that an archaeological survey would not be necessary. No other potential resources were identified.

E. Feighner did not find it necessary to conduct an archaeological survey along several small parcels of surplus land along Route 26 near Route 202 in Barrington. No other potential resources were identified.

The Town of Andover is requesting a parcel of land in Andover on both sides of the Northern Railroad along Routes 4 and 11. It wishes to install a septic tank under a parking lot that is located 41' off the centerline of the corridor. It was concluded that no cultural resources survey was necessary to sell the property.

Newington-Dover, NHS-0271(037), 11238. Participants: Pete Walker, VHB; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; Marc Laurin; and Chris Waszczuk.

P. Walker presented an overview of the alternatives. The Newington Alternatives 10a and 12a are similar and are identical near the Beane Farm and Dow House properties. The ROW and grading of Newington Alternative 13 are also quite similar to the other alternatives. The mainline shifts onto Portsmouth Waterworks Pumping Station property for all alternatives. C. Waszczuk stated that the profiles are basically the same as existing, except that the proposed extension of Woodbury Ave north of the Beane and Dow properties rather than going downhill as it presently does will go over the Turnpike thereby removing the crest and changing the roadway profile by making it level. In Dover both alternatives are basically similar and the elevations of the Turnpike are about the same as existing. The roadway approach to the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB) will be removed to accommodate a two-way access road under the Turnpike (along the existing one-way access road). The back wall of the abutment will need to be slightly modified and the wing walls will need to be retrofitted. Access to the GSB will be provided for bicyclists and pedestrians with the construction of an ADA compliant path from Hilton Park to the GSB.

There will be very minor slope encroachment onto the west side of Hilton Park to construct the path. The pavilion will not be impacted. On the east side of Hilton Park, the widening of the existing access road will result in slight impacts.

Determination of Effects on the properties within the project area Determined Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places were done by consensus agreement of the SHPO, FHWA and NHDOT as follows:

Newington

- NWN 148 – No impacts to the Benjamin Hoyt property.
- NWN 168 or the Bloody Point Depot: No impacts. A discussion ensued regarding the possibility of construction staging on this property. B. O'Donnell stated that it should be specified in the construction contract that this area not be used for staging. J. Garvin relayed that the Town is concerned with conserving this area in a natural state. C. Waszczuk stated that the DOT will specify that there would not be any staging in this state-owned wooded area.
- It was noted that while the Drive-In is not eligible for the National Register, the parcel does not appear to be completely disturbed. There may be Native American resource along the periphery of the property. DOT will deal with this issue in the Phase IB by reassessing sensitivity area and then testing those areas that do not appear to be disturbed.
- NWN 201 – No impacts to the J. Downing-Patterson property.
- NWN 204 (Beane Farm) – Adverse Effect and Section 4(f) impacts. Impacts will include, in part, minor fill on the property, loss of view of the existing crest of the hill, loss of hilltop setting due to the loss of the crest resulting from extending Woodbury Ave over the Turnpike, and loss of mature trees. Mitigation will include, in consultation with the owner, the planting of new silver maples and lilacs on the property far enough away from the power lines to avoid future trimming of the trees by the power company when they mature. Because the mapping of the boundary was inaccurate, the eligible boundary was discussed and it was agreed that it extends north from the edge of the parking lot and follows along the property lines. There was no disagreement about the placement of the boundary by Preservation Company, and the 8.22 acres is correct.
- NWN 205 (Dow House) – Adverse Effect and Section 4(f) impacts. Impacts will include removal of the stone retaining wall, minor slope impacts, and loss of shrubs. Mitigation will replace the wall in-kind (granite slabs) and landscaping with shrubs, in consultation with the owner as appropriate. The boundary was discussed, and it was agreed that it consists of the parcel only without the parking lot, thereby reducing the size of the eligible area by one-half, leaving .285 acres.
- NWN 228 – (Pumping Station) Adverse Effect and Section 4(f) impacts. Impacts result from the acquisition of a portion of the property. This is a superficial impact. The building will not be affected and will remain masked from the Turnpike as some of the existing tree buffer will remain. Mitigation consists of the documentation of the historical investigation already accomplished.

Dover

- DOV 93 (K9 Kaos or the Ira Pinkham House) – Adverse Effect and Section 4(f) impacts. The barn will be impacted by the highway slope, and strip acquisition will be required. The owners want to be acquired in total as the loss of the barn would not make the existing business viable. The Department will purchase in full. Mitigation will consist of documentation of the house and barn, investigating the barn's structure for

- documentation and for its suitability for relocation, and marketing of the two buildings. The boundary is the property line.
- DOV 098 - No Impacts.
 - DOV 099 - No Impacts.
 - DOV 104 - No Impacts.
 - DOV 113 - No Impacts. (More information would be needed if it were to be impacted)
 - DOV 125 - No Impacts.
 - DOV 134 - No Impacts.
 - DOV 136 - No Impacts.
 - DOV 151 - No Impacts.
 - DOV 138 – No Impacts.
 - Area DOV CB - No Impacts to the district.
 - Area DOV CH - No Impacts no to the district.

C. Waszczuk stated that at the request of the public a sidewalk will be designed along Boston Harbor and Dover Point Roads. The impacts along the westerly side of the roads are anticipated to remain within the ROW. Therefore, there will be no impacts if there are adjacent historic properties.

It was agreed to defer the discussion of the effects to Hilton Park (DOV 150) and the General Sullivan Bridge (DOV 158) to the next meeting in January. There are outstanding questions on the eligible boundaries, integrity issues, and the need to further investigate the time frame of the bridge construction and its relationship to the development of the park.

Concord 13184A (no federal #). Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Chris Carucci.

This project is to install a new drainage pipe on North Main Street in Concord, NH, to receive overflow from storm events in the north part of Concord. This pipe will be 30" in diameter along N. Main, and tie into an existing 24-inch dia. pipe that flows under Horse Shoe Pond Road for low flow events. A new 24-inch diameter pipe will be installed, parallel to the existing under Horse Shoe Pond Road, for over flow events. This will turn and run along the railroad embankment to a stone outfall area above Horse Shoe Pond. Because this is adjacent to the Merrimack River, E. Feighner determined that there could be archaeological impacts. It was requested that a trench test be done along the shoulder of Horse Shoe Pond Road at the proposed location of and to the proposed depth of the pipe to determine if there will be any archaeological impacts. It was suggested that the University of Maine could complete the testing.

Merrimack Village Dam (#156.01), Merrimack, NH: Dam Removal, Section 106 Consultation. Participants: Mark Wamser, Gomez and Sullivan; Eric Derleth, US Fish and Wildlife Service; Grace Levergood, NH DES; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; and Deb Loiselle, NHDES (Jim Garvin, Edna Feighner, and Linda Wilson, NHDHR [partial attendance])

The purpose of the meeting was to continue coordination efforts with the project partners and NHDHR personnel relative to the Merrimack Village Dam (MVD) Project and to reach agreement on the following:

- The geographic scope for the architectural Phase I survey;
- To identify the area of potential effect (APE) for the Phase IA archaeological assessment, and;
- To finalize the list of consulting parties relative to Section 106 consultation.

Debbie Loiselle opened the meeting and asked parties to introduce themselves. She explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the removal of the Merrimack Village Dam, the lowermost dam on the Souhegan River. Debbie noted that NOAA is serving as the lead federal agency.

Mark Wamser provided a handout of material, which is attached. He explained that Pennichuck Water Works (PWW) currently owns the MVD, which they purchased in 1964. PWW is a water supply company located in Merrimack, NH. They have never used the dam/impoundment for any purpose. In January 2004, they received a letter of deficiency from the NH Dam Safety Bureau, indicating that the dam does not meet certain dam safety criteria. Because of the liability of owning the dam, operation and maintenance costs, the letter of deficiency, and the lack of use, PWW proposes to remove the dam and apron. PWW does not propose removing other structures, such as the abutments, canal walls, etc.

Mark indicated that a feasibility study was conducted in 2004/2005. As part of the feasibility study, some cursory historical research was conducted. From this research it was learned that the original present-day dam was constructed in 1907. In 1914, the height of the dam was raised and in 1934 the dam was modified further with an ogee spillway and apron (the apron extends under the Chamberlain Bridge). Mark noted that there was discussion in the historic record that John Chamberlain operated a gristmill or sawmill in the same area of the existing dam in the 1700s. A 1906 and 1985 topographic map as well as many 1934 and current day pictures were shared. A review of the 1906 and 1985 topographic maps showed that a railroad was located close to the dam, which may have significance relative to the transportation of goods manufactured at the site.

Mark also noted that the dam was owned by Gordon Woodbury in the 1890's as part of a shoe factory. Between 1906 and 1921, WH McElwain Company took ownership and operated it to produce sole leather and leatherboard. In 1921, International Shoe purchased the facility and operated it as a tannery. Mark noted that ownership changed hands several times after the International Shoe Factory but the dates of ownership were uncertain. Other owners included Gate City Poultry Co., New England Chemical, and Harcross. It was noted that below the Chamberlain Bridge the remnants of former building foundations are present. The land in this same area may be a brownfields site. More information may be needed on the nature of the site.

Mark reviewed the chronology of events that has occurred since 2003, as seen in the attached. NHDHR notified NHDHR in May 2003 that removal of the MVD is a possibility. NHDHR responded in a June 2003 letter, requesting that a Phase I Architectural Survey be conducted and an assessment of archaeological resources relative to historic and Native American site potential. A public informational meeting was held in June 2003 to introduce the project, and no study had been completed at this juncture. Several questions were raised at the public meeting. This resulted in the formulation of an Advisory Committee consisting of NHDHR, Merrimack Planning Board, Merrimack Conservation Commission, Merrimack Community Development and PWW. The group developed a feasibility study outline aimed at answering various questions.

At the conclusion of the feasibility study, a public meeting was held in March 2005 to review the report and hold a question and answer session. Mark explained that the Merrimack Heritage Commission, NHDHR, abutters, agencies, town officials and others were contacted via direct

mail notifying them of the meeting. In addition, notices were placed in newspapers and posted on the Merrimack local government channel. It was also noted that in July 2005, the Merrimack Board of Selectman issued PWW a letter stating that the town had no interest in purchasing the dam.

There was discussion regarding the requirements to complete the Phase I Architectural Survey. Debbie Loiselle reviewed the July 2005 revised NHDHR guidelines regarding dam removal projects. Based on the guidelines, an individual dam inventory form and project area form will be required. NHDHR requested that the individual dam inventory form include not only the dam, but also structures located below the Chamberlain Bridge such as the canal, building foundations and other structures that were historically integral to the dam. Mark suggested that in order to control costs, the Phase I work should be conducted incrementally such that the dam inventory form is conducted first. It was recommended that NHDHR and other parties could then reconvene after the dam inventory form is complete to determine the extant of the project area form. The group agreed with this approach.

There was also discussion about whether the dam was an integral part of a Merrimack Historic District. Because little is known about the town history, NHDHR could not be certain. It was agreed that before any research on the historic district issue, further discussions with NHDHR should be conducted.

It was agreed that the geographic extent of the archeological Phase IA study should be within the area of demolition including staging areas, access routes, etc.

Mark reviewed the list of potential consulting parties that includes the following: Merrimack Heritage Commission, NHDHR, Society of Industrial Archaeology (Southern and Northern NE Chapters), National Trust for Historic Preservation, Historic American Engineering, and Plymouth State University Program in Heritage Studies. NHDHR indicated that the consulting parties listed in the handout (see attached) looked complete. Mark said that he would draft a letter for NOAA's signature that will be sent to the list of consulting parties to notify them of the project. Mark noted that once the letter is complete he would circulate it to NHDHR for review before sending it out.

Edna Feighner provided the individual inventory form for the Chamberlain Bridge, which is on the state register of historic places. This may provide further information on the project area. In addition, Edna provided a handout on the Dam Rehabilitation and Repair Act of 2005, which sets aside money for dam repair or rehabilitation work on dams. It is uncertain if this proposed bill has been enacted. It is interesting to note that rehabilitation is defined as repair, replacement, reconstruction or removal of the dam. A copy of the Act is appended

****Memos:** Hanover, 13935

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

| | | | | |
|------|--|--|---|-----------|
| c.c. | J. Brillhart C. Barleon, OSP Ram Maddali | K. Cota C. Waszczuk R. Roach, ACOE | N. Mayville D. Lyford H. Kinter, FHWA | Bill Cass |
|------|--|--|---|-----------|

